HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 21 Saturday, May 21, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Shadow of Yalta: The memory of the biggest bust in American diplomacy falls athwart all plans for the Big Four Conference, whenever or wherever that takes place. This fact is well recognized in the White House where President Eisenhower is getting ready to go to that "summit" meeting. And it is the underlying reason behind a scheme which Senators are already talking about in the cloakrooms.

> **The scheme is as follows: the Administration is seeking to time the Big Four Conference, whether it be in Switzerland or Sweden, for a date following the adjournment of the Senate. It's an old strategem, at least since F.D.R. came to power in the Thirties, to try to arrange foreign deals at a time when troublesome legislators are dispersed throughout the country on vacation.**

The motive for concocting such a dodge just now, according to those who watch such matters in the Capital, arises from the fact that the publication of the long secret Yalta papers has made a considerable impression on the American people. Those of the citizens who do only a little reflecting conclude that another meeting of the "Bigs," including our President, may prove disastrous. But, whatever the average citizen concludes, he has been impressed by the unbaring of what went on in 1945 at the Black Sea conference — a fact that discredits the claims of Democratic politicians (intent on protecting the memory of Roosevelt) that the Yalta papers proved a "flop."

As a matter of fact, in the past few weeks, "liberal" columnists and commentators have manifested alarm about the publicity resulting from the publication of the Yalta papers. For instance, Thomas L. Stokes, a leader among "liberal" columnists, on May 12, admitted "the Republican Party's digging up and publishing documents relating to the World War II conference is regarded as a factor, among others, that will tend to limit President Eisenhower's participation in the top-level meeting" with Bulganin, Eden and Faure.

One of the strongest pieces of evidence of the "ghost that continues to haunt" was a speech delivered by Senator Styles Bridges (R., N.H.) on the Senate floor on May 11. The speech drew an unusual number of Senators to the floor as an audience (taking them from office and committee work duties) and almost filled the chamber. Bridges most forceful theme was "Hindsight — that is the bunk."

Constantly, he hammered away on the proposition that before and after Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, he (Bridges) and other Senators had warned of the dangers of dealing with Soviet Russia and that there was the peril of losing the peace, as a consequence. Bridges heavily documented his case with quotes from the *Congressional Record* of those days, to refute the Democratic charge that critics of the Roosevelt-Truman policy are today engaging in "hindsight."

One of his prophetic utterances (on May 23, 1944) ran: "Certainly the American people have not gone into the war with the purpose of turning over Europe to the control of any nation or group of nations, much less to substitute the terror of one dictatorship for another." Needless to say, the Eastern metropolitan press gave little report of Bridges' theme: "Hindsight — that's the bunk."

GOP Strategy: Those who believe the Republicans cannot win in '56 unless Ike runs have started the "draft Ike" movement noticeable in the press in the past few days. (The kick-off of this movement was

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

— it is believed — in the form of planted stories by various prominent people that "Ike won't run [horrors]!") Despite the impression given in the press that the rank and file of the GOP are 100 percent for Ike running again, there is some dissent. One sign of such nonconcurrence was the recent meeting of Young Republicans of four states in Virginia, where they declined to commit themselves to a resolution urging Ike to come out for re-election now.

Democratic Strategy: The Democrats believe that the President will get himself in a political quagmire by going abroad to a "summit" conference and that popular repercussions against appeasement of Moscow will undermine his popularity in the big-city states necessary for re-election in '56. They recall that public reaction against the Roosevelt-Truman appeasement of Stalin played quite a role, after the last war, in producing the landslide GOP victory in the election of 1946.

Sage Democratic leaders following that defeat prompted Truman to cool off as to Russia and to back Greece, Turkey and Iran against Russia, and to give Marshall Plan aid to Western Europe between 1946 and 1948. Thereby, Truman snatched victory from defeat in that year. So — the Democrats now calculate — the donkey will be ready to start kicking the elephant where it hurts — foreign policy — by the beginning of the year 1956.

The trouble with this Democratic theory — according to comments just received from Handicapper (see his article in HUMAN EVENTS, May 7) — is that the Democrats can scarcely with effectiveness start kicking the GOP Administration for things which the Democrats have approved. Unless — of course — the Democrats elevate to their leadership a man who, as Handicapper puts it, isn't "suckered" into backing four-power conferences or "vast, expensive and usually futile foreign aid programs."

That Austrian Treaty: Republican members of Congress who scrutinize the grim facts of the Austrian Treaty (which the appeasers unaccountably seem to think an evidence of the Soviet good faith for other and larger treaties of peace) believe that the U.S. has "been had." They point out that, in the past ten years, the U.S. gave little Austria about $1 billion and that during that period Soviet Russia forced the little country to hand over to Russia about the same amount of money. Now, the Austrian treaty requires that unfortunate country to continue to pay Carthaginian reparations.

Legislators conclude that we have been paying the bills the Soviets presented to Vienna in the past decade and that, unless something is done, we will go on doing so. Members of Congress are known to dislike "foreign aid," whatever the guise, but they particularly do not like foreign aid when it is given even indirectly to Soviet Russia. Representative Lawrence Smith (R., Wis.), high ranking member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, is one of those whose voice is lifted in disapproval.

USIA In Distress: The memo of David Sarnoff, RCA chief, arguing for an expenditure of up to 3 billion dollars a year, or 7½ percent of the military defense budget, for political warfare (propaganda) against Communism, has not been of much help to the distressed U.S. Information Agency. "Has Sarnoff gone mad?" ask many members of Congress. "If USIA is wasting a large part of its present 80-million dollar appropriation, how much would it waste of 3 billion dollars?"

Eugene W. Castle, author of *Billions, Blunders and Baloney*, was the featured antagonist last week of USIA extravagance. In his testimony before a Senate appropriations subcommittee, Castle attacked the effort of USIA "to have the American people believe that its booklets and leaflets and other media provide America's only open window to the world." Castle maintained that USIA's readership was meager in comparison with that of the U.S. magazines and newspapers. He pointed out that the *Readers' Digest* international editions, published in 12 languages and sold in 58 countries, have a foreign circulation of 7,000,000. The combined foreign circulations of *Life, Saturday Evening Post, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, Colliers* and *Look* are 1,841,000. The *New York Times* overseas airmail edition has a circulation of 18,000 daily and 31,000 Sunday, and the Paris edition of the New York *Herald Tribune* has 51,000.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Castle quoted Roy Howard, who built up the United Press, as saying upon his recent return from a trip around the world, that USIA "contributes virtually nothing to U.S. prestige abroad. . . . Every day Asian countries are deluged with thousands of words from USIA — most of it 36 hours old — which has already been adequately and completely covered by the U.S. news agencies."

Castle, himself a motion picture pioneer, said USIA itself should not produce any more new educational films. "USIA already has enough product of this type to last for ten years. . . . American visual aid producers turn out hundreds of new educational films annually. Copies of these pictures can be purchased by USIA at moderate cost. . . . The USIA should immediately discontinue the production of foreign propaganda films in foreign countries to show scenes to foreigners that are familiar to them."

Press Front: HUMAN EVENTS (April 16) stated that the New York *Herald Tribune,* now under the leadership of 29-year old Ogden "Brownie" Reid, is to be transformed from a liberal to a conservative newspaper. "Brownie's" management put the paper well into the black for the first quarter of 1955, the first black-ink first quarter in many years. The HUMAN EVENTS' item was quoted in the New York *Post* as the inspiration for a 6-column feature by Irwin Ross entitled "Confusion at the *Herald Tribune*" and a 2-column commentary by owner Dorothy Schiff.

The article says the victor in a bitter brotherly feud for control of the *Herald Tribune* is Ogden Reid, described as a pro-McCarthy right-winger, who is on friendly terms with W. R. Hearst, Jr., George Sokolsky, Rabbi Schultz, Roy Cohn and Vivien Kellems. It continues that the older Reid brother, liberal "Whitey" (Whitelaw), has been kicked upstairs to the chairmanship; his name no longer appears in the masthead; he has left New York for an extended vacation.

The New York *Post,* however, offers three rays of hope to its "liberal" readers. (1) The *Herald Tribune's* chief editorial writer is still August Heckscher who, it says, is a New-Dealer and an ADA'er. (2) "Brownie," being a realist, must be "well aware that to turn the paper into a New York edition of the *Chicago Tribune* is to court disaster." (3) The 72-year old Queen Mother of the *Herald Tribune,* Mrs. Helen Reid, told Mrs. Schiff: "I'm still in overall control." Mrs. Reid's views turned sharply leftward in 1940; she influenced her husband (who died in 1947) so strongly that the *Herald Tribune* has often been called "The Park Avenue Daily Worker."

On The Labor Front: Fred C. Foy, newly-elected president of the Koppers Company, out of curiosity, went to the corporation library one day to see what labor publications were saying. After several hours of reading, he was shocked and profoundly disturbed.

Foy — with Robert Harper, an associate — spent his spare time during the next five months reading labor publications. When he got through, he wondered how many company presidents were as ignorant as he had been about the union literature being sent to their employees.

Foy found that union publications (which have a combined circulation of 15,000,000) are the real one-party press in America. They print political propaganda from the first column to the last and it is all one-sided. The fanatics who edit the journals freely lift sentences out of their context for purposes of distortion. Their language reeks with vindictiveness and vituperation. Their program calls for a maximum of socialism and a minimum of freedom.

In contrast, management publications, edited for employees, confine their columns to company sports activities, employee social news, and brief news reports about the company.

Foy and Harper comment:

"Too often the policy (of company publications) seems to be one of ducking controversial issues in employee publications, on the grounds that employees (a) wouldn't read such material, (b) wouldn't believe it, or (c) would resent it. We don't believe any one of those three reasons has a shred of validity. We believe that union members are just as anxious to be right as any other people. We believe they want to make up their own minds just like all the rest of us. But how can they do this unless both sides of the issue are presented to them? And what easier, more logical, or more direct way is there of filling in the picture than using company employee publications as the key?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"After all, if management really believes that its economic system is good for America, why should it be shy about telling its own people the why's and wherefore's? Could this hesitation, down underneath, be a feeling of weakness?"

The Foy-Harper observations are given in an article headed "Round One: Union vs. Company Publications" in the *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 1955. $2.00.

The Budget: Sound fiscal experts backing the Eisenhower candidacy in 1952 counted heavily on his pledges to balance the budget and afford business and taxpayers substantial relief. But after Senator Harry Byrd had carefully surveyed the Administration's first budget, he promptly predicted that it would remain unbalanced for a number of years. To date, the Virginia solon has proved an accurate prophet.

The Administration's first budget produced a deficit of $3,116,966,000 (fiscal year 1953-1954.) Its second budget (1954-1955) is already *over six billions in the red.* And the third budget coming up (1955-1956) shows signs of reflecting a definite upsurge in Federal spending that is likely to produce a disastrous deficit and might foreclose any hope of a substantial cut in taxes for some time to come — if ever. In the meanwhile, the Administration's spenders have already persuaded Congress to lift the debt limit on a solemn promise to pay off the increased borrowing of the government and restore the old limit — a promise that also seems headed for repudiation. It is a highly disturbing fact, say financial experts, that the Administration is sponsoring new and costly federal spending programs — greatly expanded federal aid for highways, federal aid for school construction and a new program for civilian foreign aid running over two billions (although Congress last session was supposed to have written finis to this kind of spending by ordering the FOA to close its doors.)

The State Chambers of Commerce (Room 513, 1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C.), in an interesting recent study of the budget for 1955-1956 and Congressional action on it so far, expresses pessimism. The House has already *upped* the Administration's request for agriculture expenditures. And half of the total budgetary cuts made by the House will not really reduce the spending program of the Administration because Congress has either promised to restore the cuts by deficiency appropriations or has replaced them with unspent funds from "prior year appropriations." The State Chambers study concludes that the only hope of balancing the budget is for Congress to be firm, turn down the new spending programs proposed by the Administration and restore the debt ceiling.

The alarming fact is that, from 1932 to 1954, the budget has been balanced in only three years. This picture of a protracted period of deficit financing is one of the major causes of the inflation and depreciation of the currency. The chances of rectifying matters seem dim, particularly in view of the debt situation. As it now stands — according to the estimate of Paul Peters, reliable Capital research statistician — the Federal debt is $276.5 billions; State and local debt — $29 billions; and private debt — $301.5 billions. Indeed the total indebtedness of the American people is now at the staggering high of six hundred and seven billion dollars. In short, the average American family of four — calculations show — is now mortgaged to the extent of approximately $6,500.

Letter from DR. DONALD J. COWLING, former President, Carlton College, Northfield, Minnesota: "HUMAN EVENTS is not just another publication. It is unique. It has a consistent record of interpreting political, economic and social events from the point of view of what is basic and distinctive in our American philosophy. If I were limited to one source of information regarding happenings in Washington, my choice would be HUMAN EVENTS. I have been a subscriber almost from the beginning, which is about the highest tribute one can pay."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 21 HUMAN EVENTS May 21, 1955

Article Section

THE TRUCE OF THE BEAR: THE PRESENT COMMUNIST STRATEGY

By FREDA UTLEY

"When he shows as seeking quarter,
with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril — the time
of the Truce of the Bear!"
— Rudyard Kipling, 1898

ANYONE WHO HAS studied Communist strategy and tactics knows that Moscow follows Lenin's dictum: "One step backward, two steps forward." Differently expressed, this means that Soviet policy is based on the knowledge that the maximum force of a hammer can be exerted only by raising it high in the air before striking.

This elementary truth, which applies in the political as well as the physical sphere, seems to be unknown to our policy makers. Every time the Communists relax their aggressive pressure for the sake of preparing a more powerful blow in the future, the western world breathes a sigh of relief, and imagines that the Communist blacksmith has gone home to cultivate his garden and abandoned his aim of beating the world into the shape he considers desirable. Instead of tensing our muscles to resist the next blow, or getting off the anvil, the free world goes happily to sleep believing that the danger is past.

Today we are witnessing the latest success of the well-tried Soviet tactic of lulling the free world into a false sense of security, whenever the Communists need what Lenin called a breathing spell. They have once again switched from an overtly aggressive, to a comparatively soft policy required by the exigencies of the international situation and their own internal difficulties. Now, as always in the past, when threats and force have stiffened resistance, or when the internal economic problems of the Soviet Empire have become so acute as to threaten the foundations of the Communist dictatorship, the master minds of the Kremlin resort to conciliatory gestures and start cooing like doves instead of roaring like lions. Later on, when the "soft" policy has won the maximum concessions it was designed to obtain, and also enabled them to consolidate their power and build up their offensive strength, they revert once again to an aggressive policy emphasizing the irreconcilability of "capitalist imperialism" and Communism.

One needs only to recall the Popular Front period of the mid-Thirties which enabled Moscow to gull the great majority of the liberals of the Western World, and also a goodly number of conservatives. It was the Kremlin's response to the menace of Nazi Germany and to the famine and distress which forced collectivization and the Five Year Plans had engendered inside Russia.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When it had served its purpose, Stalin switched abruptly to his alliance with Hitler. When attacked by Germany, Soviet Russia turned once again to reconciliation with the West to save itself. After Germany and Japan were defeated, the Communist bear again bared its fangs.

Thus experience has shown that the Communists are most dangerous when they speak softly. By toning down anti-western, or anti-American propaganda, and by giving some outward signs of becoming reasonable, they soften up public and government opinion in the Western democracies. By encouraging us to believe that peaceful coexistence is possible, provided only that we agree to let them enjoy their former ill-gotten gains in peace, they induce us to make as great, or greater, concessions than they could extort by force or threats. In a word, whenever a hard policy produces diminishing returns on account of the resistance it engenders, the Communists switch to a comparatively soft line until such time as, in turn, it ceases to be profitable. It's a sure thing. Heads they win, and tails we lose, again and again and again, everywhere in the world.

THE PROCESS OF softening us up began immediately after President Eisenhower's inauguration. The Republican victory, won on a platform which promised "an end to the negative, futile and immoral policy of containment" and offered the prospect of a "rollback" of the Iron Curtain and the liberation of captive peoples, threatened to destroy the Soviet Power. Stalin's death made it all the easier for the Kremlin to meet the threat by pretending that the Communist power no longer sought to dominate the world. Eisenhower duly responded to the first Soviet peace overtures by saying, on March 19, 1953, that the Soviet leaders would never be met "less than half way" if they wanted peace.

"Less than halfway" could not but mean abandoning the Republican campaign promises to liberate the Soviet captive peoples in Europe and China. So, as night follows day, we had the "settlement" of the Korean War on terms which consigned the North Koreans to Communist slavery, and forbade Syngman Rhee ever to attempt liberation of all his people. So also inevitably, step by step, the Republican Administration — which had first "unleashed" Chiang Kai-shek's forces — began to pressure the Nationalist Government on Formosa to promise never to attempt to liberate China from Communist slavery. This was the price exacted for United States' support and aid for the defense of Formosa in the treaty alliance ratified in February, 1955.

So far, so good, from the point of view of the Kremlin. But this was only the beginning of the advantages which the junta which rules over the vast Soviet Empire in Europe and Asia expects from the "soft" line of policy which it is temporarily pursuing. The dividends which it is yielding are already apparent. The effect of our "retreat and appeasement" policy in the Formosa Strait will surely not be confined to Asia, where Japan is losing faith that ours is the winning side, and where the demoralization of the Chinese Nationalist Army is to be expected as a result of our having extinguished all hope that we shall ever permit it to liberate the mainland. The effect in Europe is likely to be equally disastrous.

Another clever tactic of the Communists is to make us look East when they are busy in the West, and *vice versa*. In 1948 and 1949, while we were preoccupied with the Soviet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blockade of Berlin, the Communists completed their conquest of China. Today, while our eyes have been fixed on the danger of war in the Formosa Strait, Moscow has been busy undermining our strength in Germany. The turn to a "soft", or comparatively conciliatory, policy was synchronized with the Communist effort to wean the German Federal Republic from its western alliance.

While Chou En-lai was successfully countering the pro-American forces at Bandung by soft words and conciliatory gestures calculated to allay the rising anti-Communist sentiment in Asia, the Austrians were invited to Moscow to conclude a treaty giving them freedom and independence on condition that they become as neutral as Nehru's India. This action produced a double dividend. It not only cut Italy off from direct communication via the Brenner Pass with the NATO forces in Germany. It also offered a potent inducement to the Germans to abandon the western alliance for the sake of liberating their twenty million countrymen in East Germany. The Austrian Treaty, far from constituting evidence that the Kremlin wants to coexist peacefully with us, demonstrates the diabolical cleverness of the Communists in undermining the latent strength of the free world.

At his press conference on April 27, the President, instead of understanding Moscow's clever poker game, pointed to the Austrian Treaty as warrant for his "feeling" that "things are on the upswing." Eisenhower also, once again, displayed his terrifying ignorance of the sources of Communist strength. Far from realizing that we are losing the struggle for the world because the peoples and nations threatened by Communist conquest are losing faith in our resolution to fight for their liberty or our own, the President stated (as grounds for his optimism) that "More of the world is beginning finally to have confidence that the United States is not trying to establish a new form of colonialism, and doing it just through purchases, money and economic penetration."

Can one interpret these words otherwise than to mean that the Republican President of the United States, like Adlai Stevenson, believes that the Communists advance from strength to strength because of their promises of "liberal" social and economic reforms, whereas the "imperialist" West suffers from "reactionary" conservatism? Do not his words mean that he believes that if we are very virtuous and self-denying, and continue to pour out our wealth to help underprivileged nations, the Communist menace will disappear? Is there really any difference between the views and beliefs, or illusions, of our Republican President and those of President Truman, who, on July 16, 1948, wrote as follows to Edwin W. Pauley?

> **"By making possible the formulation and execution of liberal reforms such as the nationalization of certain industries and land redistribution, which are desired by a majority of Koreans, this policy should also help to broaden the basis for an understanding with the Russians."**

Is there, in effect, any difference between the Marshall-Acheson line, to which Truman succumbed, and the Eisenhower line? Is not Eisenhower in the grip of, or under the influence of, the same advisers who believe that all that is required of us to obtain peace in our time is to show evidence that our economic, social and political objectives are as "progressive" and "peace-loving" as those of the Soviet power? How otherwise can one explain Eisenhower's trust in the good faith of his "good friend" Marshal Zhukov,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with whom — he tells us — he got along very well while the Red Army was sacking and raping in Berlin? It evidently never seems to have dawned on our President that anyone can get along with the Soviets provided one gives them a free hand.

Zhukov's recent message to the Overseas Press Club, in which he said he was sure that our President "will do his best to promote in practice the cause of world peace" may be considered complimentary by those who imagine that Nehru's moral approbation is worth the sacrifice of all the people who have believed that the United States stands for liberty for others besides her own people. But no one who is concerned with the security of the United States, or with the survival of free governments elsewhere in the world, will consider Zhukov's remark as a compliment to our President.

IT IS ONE of the many ironies which history has produced that this Republic, which was born as a result of the insistence of the British colonies in America that they should not be taxed without representation, is, today, taxing itself for Britain's benefit, not only without representation in her Parliament, but in complete subservience to the requirements of British foreign policy.

There is little doubt that Britain has been largely, if not mainly, responsible for persuading the United States Administration to make concessions to Peiping and Moscow which will alienate from us all those who have dared to resist the Communist power.

Today, Communist influence on American policy is no longer exerted directly by our own Alger Hisses, Harry Dexter Whites and other "liberals." It is now exerted indirectly by Britain whose policy would appear to be based on the supposition that the English speaking peoples can be saved by satiating the Communist Moloch with the carcasses of other nations. After Churchill successfully achieved the liquidation of the British Empire which he professed he would prevent, Britain has to try and preserve appearances by pandering to Nehru and others of his kind. So we get the curious present situation which can be summarized as follows:

Moscow keeps Peiping in line;
Peiping keeps Nehru in line;
Nehru keeps Britain in line;
Britain keeps the United States in line . . .

all to the ultimate end of enabling the Communists to win the battle for the world by determining U.S. policy.

Shall we ever learn? Probably not until it is too late to avoid a struggle to the death for the survival of an isolated United States. The inevitable result of abandoning the allies who wish to fight with us for their own liberty and ours, in favor of the appeasement policy advocated by Britain and France and our own anti-anti-Communists, cannot but lead to disaster. If we continue in our present course, we can have only the satisfaction of knowing that the inscription on the tomb of liberty will read: "Their intentions were excellent."

But, in the meantime, of course, we can have fun before the deluge.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED